

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8, 10, 17 and 19-20 are amended; Claims 7 and 16 are canceled; and the Title is amended by the present amendment. Support for amended Claims 1, 8, 10, 17 and 19-20 can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings¹. Therefore, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action the Specification was objected to; Claim 7 was objected to; Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Suzuki (US Publication 2002/0033964); and Claim 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Suzuki.

In response to the objection to the Specification, the Title is amended to more clearly describe the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to Claim 7, Claim 7 is canceled, rendering the objection moot.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection as discussed next.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 10 recite novel features not taught or suggested by the applied reference.

Briefly summarizing, Claim 1 is directed to an image forming apparatus including a scanner engine and an operation panel. The image forming apparatus further includes a display part, which is *configured to display a number of destinations for data scanned by*

¹ Claims 1, 10 and 19-20 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of original Claim 7. Claims 8 and 17 are amended to depend from Claims 1 and 10, respectively.

the scanner engine. A scanning process part is configured to cause the scanner engine to scan a document to produce scanned data, and a transfer part is configured to transfer the scanned data to one or more selected transfer destinations. The image forming apparatus further includes a ***print processor part configured to receive the scanned data from a storing area of the selected transfer destination and print the scanned data.*** With this configuration, scanned data, which has been stored at a destination outside the apparatus, can be printed by the apparatus without using a client terminal to access the scanned data, increasing the efficiency of accessing and using remotely stored data. Amended independent Claim 10, while directed to a scanned data process method used in an image forming apparatus, recites *inter alia* a step of ***displaying a selection screen for selecting a transfer destination and printing the scanned data on a print process part included in the image forming apparatus.***

Turning now to the applied reference, Suzuki describes an image administering system, for distributing and processing a copy job efficiently. Suzuki sets out to address two problems: if a copy job of a document is read in by a scanner in one office and is immediately transferred to another office, the transfer duration may be unacceptably prolonged depending on the load of the network;² and how a copy job can be efficiently distributed and processed.³ To address these problems, Suzuki describes a distributed processing system and an image administering system in which a plurality of image outputting systems having a scanner for reading an image of a document, a plurality of printers, a printer server and a file system are distributed and connected through a network.⁴

² Suzuki, paragraph [0006], lines 2-5.

³ Suzuki, paragraph [0007], lines 5-6.

⁴ Suzuki, paragraph [0002], lines 6-11.

Suzuki is concerned with providing an administration apparatus and an electronic filing method.⁵

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Suzuki in paragraph [0095] describes a display panel, which functions as a user interface for inputting data by touching one of the icons displayed, and equates it to the display part *configured to display a number of destinations for data scanned by the scanner engine* of Claim 1.⁶ In fact, Suzuki describes in paragraph [0095]:

“...a user interface for displaying a print control screen having a plurality of icons and ... for inputting data of printing format....”

Thus, Suzuki describes how the user interface is used to select a printing format, not a destination for scanned data. This passage does not describe any type of destination for data scanned by the scanner engine. In fact, Suzuki describes in a different passage how a destination is selected:

“...at Step 135 the output **destination** is reset according to a job amount determined from the output format and image data.”⁷ [emphasis added]

and

“When the job amount is larger than the predetermined value, that is, the output number contained in the output format is larger than the predetermined output number value...it is decided that processing at the production center is appropriate. If the output **destination** has been set to a printer at the satellite shop, the output destination is reset to a printer at the production center.”⁸ [emphasis added]

Thus, Suzuki teaches a specific approach for setting a destination which relies on the job amount and the output format, and appears to be automatically set by some process based on the job amount and the output format. Therefore, Suzuki does not teach or suggest setting an output destination by selecting it on a display which is a part of an image forming

⁵ Suzuki, [0012].

⁶ Office Action, page 3, lines 2-7.

⁷ Suzuki, paragraph [0155], lines 4-6.

⁸ Suzuki, paragraph [0156], lines 1-9.

apparatus. Consequently, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest a *display part configured to display a number of destinations for data scanned by the scanner engine.*

Furthermore, the outstanding Office Action asserts that Suzuki describes in paragraphs [0132] and [0134], and Figures 5 and 6B, a print process part as disclosed in original Claims 7 and 16⁹, and incorporated into amended Claims 1 and 10, respectively. In fact, Suzuki describes in these paragraphs a printing routine for verifying whether a printer can print, and re-designating a printer if it cannot, where the “status of a printer 16 designated to execute a job is confirmed,”¹⁰ “whether or not the printer 16 is printable.”¹¹ “If the printer 16...cannot print...the operator is instructed...to re-designate the printer 16.”¹² “When the printability is determined...image data inputted from the scanner 12 are transmitted through the network 10 from the server 14 to the printer 16” which “records an image...on the recording paper.”¹³ Further, Suzuki describes printers located at different office locations from the scanner.¹⁴ Thus, the printer 16 described by Suzuki, is geographically displaced from a scanner, and is not a print processor part of an image forming apparatus, which includes a scanner part. Consequently, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest an image forming apparatus including a scanner part and a *print processor part configured to receive the scanned data from a storing area of the selected transfer destination and print the scanned data.*

Thus, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest an image forming apparatus with all the limitations of Claim 1, or a scanned data process method with all the limitations of Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 10, and all claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the applied reference. Accordingly, Applicants

⁹ Office Action, page 5, lines 10-16.

¹⁰ Suzuki, paragraph [0132], lines 3-4.

¹¹ Suzuki, paragraph [0132], lines 5-6.

¹² Suzuki, paragraph [0132], lines 6-13.

¹³ Suzuki, paragraph [0134], lines 1-12.

¹⁴ Suzuki, Figure 8 shows “Shared Scanner” 12AX at a “Head Office,” while printers 16₁Y-16₃Y are at a “Branch Office,” implying the printer and the scanner are not physically co-located.

Application No. 10/660,535
Reply to Office Action of December 3, 2007

respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Suzuki, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection as discussed next.

Claim 19 is amended to recite an image forming apparatus reciting the same limitations as Claim 1, drafted to invoke interpretation under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. Claim 20 includes all the limitations of Claim 10. Therefore, as discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 10, the applied reference, Suzuki, fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 19 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early action favorable to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)